

process and through life that need to have a compromise. Why not take the situation as it is, work on it, have a program. Now, of course, 204, Senator Koch, the amendment that I offered to the amendment that Senator Barnett offered to Senator Merz' bill, which is basically, 203, the bill I introduced. 204 is basically the bill I introduced. In fact, it is almost exactly 203 but the problem that has come about, you and I, members of the Legislature, have been receiving or had received a lot of that mail from those people involved in the industry and they said we don't want an earmark. Well, some people say, tough. That is what you recommended. Let's say, tough. Let's go ahead and do it but the thing that concerns me is earmarking in a way. I can share your concern. I, perhaps, feel as your state aid to education that there should perhaps be earmarking for that, depth defining 1% of the sales tax to aid to education but this isn't the point here. The amendment that Senator DeCamp offered to the body also takes out of 204 the sunset provision of which we had in 203 which is contained in 204. It said that this act, if not okayed by the Legislature, would expire in three years. Now I view this somewhat as you do, Senator Koch. I would perhaps rather have the earmarking, but rather than not have the bill, I would rather take it in this position and I would rather have those people from those six community health centers and the alcohol programs come to the appropriations committee next year and say this is what we are doing, this is why we need it and this is why it is a good program just as any other state agency has to do. Now I understand your concern and I share somewhat the other but remind you that this is a compromise that came about and those factions, not just the liquor industry, but other members of the Legislature were against earmarking, not just the liquor industry. Senator DeCamp's amendment, I hope you will buy it. I hope you will take it and then I hope you will take his next motion because in his amendment you are taking the funding mechanism out of 204. We want to bring 220 back that is on I believe Final Reading now or E & R engrossing. It is the bill that Senator Schmit introduced relating to litter. We will bring it back, strip it, put the funding mechanism in. The intent will be in 204. The funding mechanism will be in 200 and we will have the A bill for 204A which is included in the Governor's appropriation bill which is a million one or a million two. So I would ask you to look at those things and accept the DeCamp amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I guess I want to find out a little bit more what is going on here and why we are going to compromise. As I understand, Senator Merz and others agreed to this compromise because they were told that they just didn't have the votes to get it through and I am not sure that that is exactly true. But I would like to know perhaps from some of the authors of this great compromise why it makes so much difference to the liquor industry whether these funds are earmarked or not and so perhaps I will address that question to Senator DeCamp who is sponsoring the compromise here, if you would yield please.

SENATOR DeCAMP: There are a number of reasons. I am sure